



## SURAKARTA ENGLISH AND LITERATURE JOURNAL

**Vol 1 No.1 AUGUST 2018**

Publisher Language and Literature Faculty, University of Surakarta

ISSN Print: 2621-9077 ISSN Online: 2621-9085

### **COMPLAINT AS AN ACT (Complaint Analysis in *Twilight* Novel)**

Hetty Catur Ellyawati

Faculty of Technological Information & Communication, University of Semarang. catur@usm.ac.id

---

#### **ABSTRACT**

Complaint as a communicative act can be divided into two categories. First, as a face threatening act when it is uttered directly, second, it becomes a politeness when it uses indirectness. This research is explanatory research which tries to explain why complaint can have many different strategies. For data collection, the writer used purposive sampling taken from *Twilight* novel written by Stephani Meyer, but the writer chose Bahasa Indonesia version. While for analyzing the data, the writer used substitution method with social context consideration. From the data analysis, it is found that complaint is always a face threatening act when it is used directly.

Keywords: complaint, face threatening act, politeness, directness, indirectness.

#### **ABSTRAK**

Komplain sebagai salah satu tindak komunikatif dapat digolongkan dalam dua kategori yaitu sebagai tindak mengancam muka jika dilakukan secara langsung dan sebagai kesopanan jika tindak ini menggunakan strategi tidak langsung. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian eksplanatori yang berusaha menjelaskan mengapa tindak complain menggunakan strategi yang berbeda dalam tuturannya. Untuk pengumpulan data, penulis menggunakan metode *purposive sampling* dari novel *Twilight* (terjemahan) karya Stephani Meyer tetapi penulis memilih versi Bahasa Indonesia. Sementara untuk analisis data, penulis menggunakan metode substitusi yang mempertimbangkan konteks sosial. Dari hasil analisis data ditemukan bahwa tindak complain selalu merupakan tindak mengancam muka bagi pihak yang dikomplain jika tindak tersebut dilakukan secara langsung.

Kata kunci: tindak komplain, tindak mengancam muka, kesopanan, strategi langsung, strategi tidak langsung.

## INTRODUCTION

Complaint as communicative act can be seen as speech act of complaining that is an abusive act or as a face threatening act. From the polite point of view, complaint is the non polite one (Ghaznavi, 2017). Someone who utters complaint sometimes prefers conveying it indirectly to avoid threatening his hearer's face. Some utterances regard as a complaint if it contains moral judgments which express the speaker's approval as well as disapproval of the behaviour mentioned in the judgment.

This paper will explain how a complaint can be seen as an abusive act or non polite ones in *Twilight* novel by using the categories and strategies of complaining. While, the problems which I want to share here are about the use of complaint categories and strategies in utterances in *Twilight* novel as an indirect or direct speech act which can threaten face or in contrast it is the non polite ones.

## METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The study is explanatory research. The writer tries to explain the utterances conveying complaint directly or indirectly. The samples are taken from the utterances of *Twilight* novel by using purposive sampling technique that consists of 25 subtitles. The pragmatic method is used to analyze the data. This method proposes the importance of situational context. Besides, this research uses reflective and substitutive ones.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Complaint as speech act

Complaint is one of the expressive acts that can threaten face either directly or indirectly. Complaint as a speech act belongs to the category of expressive functions in Trosborg that is quoted by Ghaznavi (2017). This category includes moral judgments which express the speaker's approval as well as disapproval of the behaviour mentioned in the judgments in a complaint, the events described in the proposition took place in the past. According to Vanderveken:

To complain, in the expressive use, is to express discontent. There is a preparatory condition to the effect that the situation complained about is bad (for the speaker, at least). It is not the case that the hearer is taken to be responsible for the bad situation, since one can complain about states of affairs which are independent of the hearer such as bad luck, poor health, etc, as well as something that the hearer might have done.

### The complaint as an abusive act

Trosborgin Ghazavi (2017) stated that a complaint is to define as an illocutionary act in

which the speaker (the complainer) expresses his or her disapproval, negative feeling etc. She added, towards the state of affairs described in the proposition (the complainable) and for which he or she holds the hearer (complainee) responsible, either directly or indirectly.

### **The complaint as a face-threatening act**

A complaint is a 'face-threatening act'. It is the act of moral censure or blame is an act of social rejection. An act is the accuser breaks ties of affection, mutual support, and co-operation.

### **The non-politeness of complaints**

Politeness causing offence is part of the conflictive function and complaints are by definition non-polite. It points out "politeness is out of the question" and "to threaten or curse someone in a polite manner is virtually a contradiction in term".

From the description above, it is stated that there are some categories of complaining, namely:

### **No explicit reproach**

The complainer does not directly state that something is bad, the complainee does not know whether an offence is referred to or not. Trosborg added that it is to avoid a conflict.

#### **Strategy 1. Hints**

For examples:

- (1) *Don't see much of you these days, do I?*
- (2) *The kitchen was clean and orderly when I left it last*

### **Expression of annoyance or disapproval**

A complainer can express his or her annoyance, dislike, disapproval, and so on, concerning a certain state of affairs he or she considers bad for him or her. By explicitly asserting a deplorable state of affairs in the presence of the complainee, the complainer implies that he or she holds the complainee responsible but avoids mentioning him or her as the guilty person. The utterance may also express the ill consequences resulting from an offence for which the complainee is held implicitly responsible.

#### **Strategy2. Annoyance**

For examples:

- (3) *You know I don't like dust, I'm allergic to dust, didn't you know it?*
- (4) *Look at these things, all over the place.*

**Strategy3. Consequences**

For example:

- (5) *But look, I mean, try to look at it from my point of view, I mean, I'm here and the whole thing falls back on me, I have got to live in this dump, you know, and it's not very nice sitting here night after night at home, you know, and just looking round at all the mess.*

**Accusation**

Accusation seeks to establish the agent of a complainable. There are two levels of directness.

**Strategy4. Indirect Accusation**

The complainer can ask the hearer questions about the situation or assert that he or she was in some way connected with the offence and thereby try to establish the hearer as a potential agent of the complainable.

For example:

- (6) *Look at the mess, haven't you done any cleaning up for the last week?*

**Strategy5. Direct accusation**

For example:

- (7) *You don't even clean up after you when you've been there, you used to do it, what's up with you now?*

**Blaming**

An act of blame presupposes that the accused is guilty of the offence. Three levels are identified with respect to the explicitness with which the complainer formulates his or her moral condemnation of the accused.

**Strategy 6. Modified blame**

- (8) *It's boring to stay here, and I hate living in a mess, anyway you ought to clean up after you*

**Strategy 7. Explicit condemnation of the accused's action**

- (9) *You never clean up after you, I'm sick and tired of it*

**Strategy 8. Explicit condemnation of the accused as a person**

- (10) *Mette (swear-word), really, one can never (swear-word) trust you a damn.*

**ANALYSIS**

**Analysis data (11).**

Data (11) used no explicit reproach category, strategy 1. Hint. The explanation is as follow:

(11)+*Jadi Edward, tidakkah kau piker Isabell perlu diberi kesempatan menggunakan mikroskop?*

- *Bella. Sahut Edward. Sebenarnya dia mengidentifikasi tiga dari lima slide itu.*

+*So Edward, don't you think that Isabella needs to have a chance to use microscope?*

-*Bella. Said Edward. Actually, she identified three from those five slides.*

The conversation happened in the classroom when (+), a teacher, questioned (-), a high school student, about his opinion of turning the microscope usage. (+)'s utterance is not for questioning but for complaining (-) in a soft way because (+) thought that (-) had monopolized the microscope for himself. (+)'s utterance is understood by (-), it is proved by his utterance '*Sebenarnya dia mengidentifikasi tiga dari lima slide itu*' (*Actually, she identified three from those five slides*) which indicate that (-) did not monopolize the microscope.

When the force of the question of (+) is for asking (-)'s opinion about giving his turn using a microscope to his friend, the utterance may be change into the following:

(11)+ *Jadi Edward, tidakkah kaupikir Isabell perlu diberi kesempatan menggunakan mikroskop?*

- *Ya Bu, saya piker begitu.*

+*So Edward, don't you think that Isabella needs to have a chance to use microscope?*

- *yes, I think so*

### Analysis data (12)

Data (12) used strategy 4, indirect accusation. The explanation is as follow:

(12) + *Bella*

- *Apa? Apa kau berbicara denganku lagi?*

+ *tidak, tidak juga.*

- *lalu apa yang kau mau?*

+ *aku minta maaf*

+*Bella*

-*what? Do you talk to me again?*

+*no, not really*

-*so, what you want?*

+*Iam so sorry*

Conversation happened in the classroom. After long time (+) did have a chat with (-) even though they were partner in Biology class. When finally (+) greeted (-) by mentioning (-)'s name, (-) reply implied (+) with indirect accusation that finally (+) wanted to have chat with (-).

Data (12) would not be a indirect accusation when + reply was:

- (12) a + Bella  
- Apa? Apa kau berbicara denganku lagi?  
+ iya  
  
+Bella  
-what? Do you talk to me again?  
+yes

### Analysis data (13).

Data (13) used no explicit reproach category, strategy 1. Hint. The explanation is as follow:

- (13) + *Aku hanya bertanya-tanya...maukah kau pergi ke pesta dansa musim semi denganku?*  
- *kupikir, ceweklah yang mengajak.*  
  
+*I am only questioning...would you like to go to spring break dance party with me?*  
-*I think, it is the girl who asked*

The conversation happened in the classroom when (+), a man, asked (-), a female high school student to go to *pesta dansa musim semi* (spring break dance party) event. (-)'s utterance is not directly answering (+) about his ask. (-) utterance implicitly denied (+) ask to go to *pestadansa* (dance party) by saying that usually it is a girl who asks for a boy to go to dance party. By stating the utterance, (-) wanted (+) to know that (-) denied his request.

### Analysis data (14).

Data (14) used expression of annoyance or disapproval category, strategy 2 annoyance. The explanation is as follow:

- (14)+ '*kau kasar sekali*'  
- '*sudah terbuka*'  
  
+*you are very rude*'  
-*it is already opened*

The conversation happened when (-) wanted to drive (+) home because (+) was sick, but (+) refused It, she felt that she was okay. Then, (-) pushed (+) to get into the car and made her said '*kau kasar sekali*' (*you are very rude*). (+)'s utterance is an expression of annoyance to (-) for his act.

(+)'s utterance also can be a face threatening act for (-) that can threat (-)'s negative face. It is realized by (-) with his utterance '*sudah terbuka*' (*it is already opened*) to point out that the car's door has already opened and also to ignore the threaten from (+)'s utterance.

Look at the differences in data (14) a below in which does not show annoyance just like data (14).

- (14)a + kau kasar sekali  
- iya, memang aku kasar.

+*you are very rude.*  
-*yes, iam.*

The indirectness shown by (-) in data (14) is a neglection to (-) that (-) did not answer (+)'s utterance directly by saying '*iya, memang aku kasar*' (*yes, I am*). When (+) answered (-) just like in data (13) a, it may cause (+) to get hurt. In reality, (-) did not want to hurt (+). If (-) hurts (+) his relationship may be affected by his expression.

### Analysis data (15).

Data (15) used accusations category, strategy 4indirect accusation. The explanation is as follow:

- (15) + 'Gila'  
- 'kenapa?'  
+ '*kau melaju seratus mil perjam. Apa kau mencoba membunuh kita berdua?*'  
- '*kita tidak akan tabrakan*'  
  
+*It is crazy*  
-*Why crazy?*  
+*you move 100 mil per hour. Are you trying to kill us?*  
-*we are not going to have a crash*

The context of the data (15) is that (-) took (+) home from out city. They had a nice conversation on the way but when (+) saw the car's speedometer, she got shock because (-) run the car too fast. (+), then asked (-) a question '*apa kamu mencoba membunuh kita berdua?*' (*Are you trying to kill us*).

(+)'s utterance above is not just a question but it implied an accusation for (-). It is proved by (-)' utterance '*kita tidak akan tabrakan*' (*we are not going to have a crash*). (-)'s utterance will be different if (+)'s utterance is for asking as fragment below:

- (15)a. + '*kau melaju seratus mil perjam. Apa kau mencoba membunuh kita berdua?*'  
- *ya, itu memang maksudku.*  
- '*tentu saja tidak, bagaimana mungkin!*'  
  
+*you move 100 mil per hour. Are you trying to kill us?*  
-*ya, that's what i mean*  
-*Of course not, how come!*

The accusation category focuses on the complainable. On data (15) the complainer focuses on the 'speed' of the car and the problem it causes.

### Analysis data (16).

Data (16) used blaming category, strategy 6 modified blame and strategy 7 explicit condemnation of the accused's action. The explanation is as follow:

- (16) + 'Teori lagi?'  
- 'Mm-hm?'  
+ 'kuharap kau lebih kreatif kali ini...atau kau masih mengutip dari buku-buku komik?'  
- 'well, aku tidak mendapatkannya dari komik, tapi aku juga tidak menduga-duganya sendiri.'  
  
+theory again?  
-Mm-hm?  
+I hope you are more creative this time..or you still quote from comics?  
-well, I don't get it from comis, I also don't quest by my self

The conversation above happened when (+) and (-) talk about the theory that is made by (-). (-)'s theory before adopted from the comic, so when (+) wants to tell her theory, (-) stated his disapproval by his utterance 'kuharap kau lebih kreatif kali ini' and his explicit condemnation 'atau kau masih mengutip dari buku-buku komik?'

### CONCLUSION

From the data analysis above, complaint can be conveyed directly or indirectly. Indirect complaint can be seen in data (11), (12), (13) and data (15). The complainer in both data conveys the complaint by asking a question. Even though, it was an indirectness. While, the direct complaint can be seen in data (14) and (16).

The writer can say that complaint is always be a face threatening act for the complaine. It means that complaint is always an abusive act for the complaine and the non-polite ones.

### REFERENCES

- Allan, K., &SalmaniNodoushan, M.A. (2015) *Pragmatics: The State of the Art (An Online Interview with Keith Allan)*. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 9 (3), 147-154.
- Bermejo-Luque, Lilian (2011). *Giving Reasons: a Linguistics-Pragmatics Approach to Argumentation Theory*. Berlin: Springer.



- Ghaznavi, Maryam Ahmadi. (2017). *The Speech Act of Complaining: Definition and Characterization*. Iran: Islamic Azad University.
- Harnish, Robert M. (2009). *Internalism and Externalism in Speech Act Theory*. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 5:1, pp. 9-31. DOI: 10.2478/v10016-0001-2.
- Kurdghelashvili, Tinatin. (2015). *Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies in an EFL Classroom in Georgia*. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology. International Journal of Cognitive and Language Science*. Vol: 9, No:1.
- Maitra, Ishani (2011). *Assertion, norms and games*. In: *Jessica Brown and Herman Cappelen (eds), Assertion*. New philosophical essays pp. 277-296. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pagin, Peter. (2015). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2015 Edition),